

Page 3 HEARING re 22-01139-mg Celsius Network Limited et al v. Stone et al Status Conference Using Zoom for Government. Transcribed by: Sonya Ledanski Hyde

Γ	Pg 4 01 29
	Page 4
1	APPEARANCES:
2	
3	AKIN GUMP STRAUSS HAUER FELD, LLP
4	Attorneys for Plaintiffs Celsius Network Limited
5	One Bryant Park
6	New York, NY 10036
7	
8	BY: DEAN CHAPMAN
9	MITCHELL HURLEY
10	ELIZABETH SCOTT
11	
12	KYLE ROCHE P.A.
13	Attorneys for KeyFi, Stone
14	260 Madison Avenue, 8th Floor
15	New York, NY 10016
16	
17	BY: KYLE WILLIAM ROCHE
18	
19	ALSO PRESENT:
20	UDAY GORREPATI
21	ANA LUCIA HURTADO
22	MICHAEL STANLEY
23	COURTNEY BURKS STEADMAN
24	KAILA ZAHARIS
25	CHARLES M. ABONCE

1	Pg 5 0f 29	
		Page 5
1	ARTUR ABREU	
2	DAVID J. ADLER	
3	KATHERINE AIZPURU	
4	EMMANUEL ALBINO	
5	SAMEER ALIFARAG	
6	NELLY ALMEIDA	
7	RENE A. AMAYA	
8	BRIAN BARNES	
9	ROBERT BEAULAC	
10	CHRIS BECIN	
11	HUGH BELLAMY	
12	JARNO BERG	
13	SOMA BISWAS	
14	MATTI BLECHER	
15	OCTAVE J. BOURGEOIS	
16	PHILIP BRENDEL	
17	JOHAN BRONGE	
18	VINCENT JAMES BURNISKE	
19	AMY CASTOR	
20	JAY CHAI	
21	ERIC CHAN	
22	RICKIE CHANG	
23	KARM CHOUDHRY	
2 4	ROBERT CHRISTIANSEN	
25	CHRISTINA CIANCARELLI	

	Pg 6 01 29	
		Page 6
1	JOSHUA CLARK	
2	CHRISTOPHER COCO	
3	DAKEN COLEMAN	
4	AARON COLODNY	
5	ROBERT J. COMINOS	
6	MICHAEL CONLON	
7	LAFAYETTE A. COOK	
8	KAREN CORDRY	
9	CARL J. COTE	
10	PAUL CUPP	
11	DAVID DALHART	
12	JOSH DAUM	
13	JAMES B. DEGLAU	
14	MARY DELGADO	
15	CURT DELL	
16	THOMAS DIFIORE	
17	TRISTAN LUIS DIAZ	
18	REUBEN DIZENGOFF	
19	SCOTT DUFFY	
20	DREW DUFFY	
21	DENNIS DUNNE	
22	BEN EADES	
23	JANELL ECKHARDT	
24	DANIEL EGGERMANN	
25	SIMON ELIMELECH	

	Pg 7 01 29	
		Page 7
1	PAUL FABSIK	
2	DAVID AVERY FAHEY	
3	ALEXANDER FERNANDEZ	
4	FLORENCE FLANNIGAN	
5	FORREST L. FORMSMA	
6	WILLIAM FOSTER	
7	DEBORAH FRANKEL	
8	DANIEL FRISHBERG	
9	ARLISHEA FULTON	
10	REBECCA GALLAGHER	
11	CHRISTOPHER GASTELU	
12	JASLEIGH GEARY	
13	UTSAV GHOSH	
14	BRADLEY GIARDIELLO	
15	VINCENT GOETTEN	
16	RYAN GOLDSTEIN	
17	RAMON GONZALES	
18	MICHAEL DAVID GRAUBERT	
19	TAMMY L. GROVER	
20	MIRA HAQQANI	
21	PHILIPPE HEGI	
22	SAMUEL P. HERSHEY	
23	JEREMY HILL	
24	DAVID HOLLERITH	
25	KYLE HOLZHAUER	

1	Py o 01 29
	Page 8
1	CHRISTIAN DARIUS HUNKELER
2	JASON IOVINE
3	RAUL JIMENEZ
4	GREG KACKOWSKI
5	TYLER KALIN
6	JEFF KAPLAN
7	ROBERT M. KAUFMANN
8	SAM KAVA
9	MIKAELA KENSINGTON
10	CORANNE KERR
11	KULPREET S. KHANUJA
12	DIETRICH KNAUTH
13	TOMAS KOSTER
14	BRYAN KOTLIAR
15	JOSEPH LALIA
16	HUONG LAM
17	MARK D. LARRABEE
18	JEAN-PHILIPPE LATREILLE
19	CATHY LAU
20	VINCENT EDWARD LAZAR
21	ANDREW LEBLANC
22	JOSEPH LEHRFELD
23	OLEKSANDR LEONENKO
24	MARK LINDSAY
25	ISAAC R. LLEWELLYN

	Pg 9 of 29	
		Page 9
1	DAVID LOS ARCOS CARCAMO	
2	JASON LU	
3	KEVIN M. MANUS	
4	CHASE MARSH	
5	KYLE MASON	
6	BRIAN S. MASUMOTO	
7	CAROL MAUNDER	
8	DAVID MAYO	
9	KEITH MCCORMACK	
10	JAMES MCNAMARA	
11	ALEXANDER MICHAELS	
12	ERICKA MIGNUCCI	
13	LAYLA MILLIGAN	
14	TIMON MITRAKAS	
15	CATARINA MOURA	
16	KEITH NOYES	
17	MARY O'BRIEN	
18	KYLE J. ORTIZ	
19	SAM OSBORNE	
20	RICHARD E. OSWALD	
21	SHANE OWENS	
22	CHRISTOPHER PAGNANELLI	
23	MILIN PATEL	
24	PETER PATZAK	
25	ARIE PELED	

	Py 10 01 29
	Page 10
1	GREGORY F. PESCE
2	SHOBA PILLAY
3	LUKE PORCARI
4	DONALD POYNTER
5	ANNEMARIE V. REILLY
6	TIMOTHY REILLY
7	ANUBHAV RICHARDS
8	ANDREW S. RICHMOND
9	MARK ROBINSON
10	ANDREW RUDOLPH
11	PRIYA SAIHGAL
12	DAVID SCHNEIDER
13	NOAH M. SCHOTTENSTEIN
14	WILLIAM D. SCHROEDER
15	DAVID SENES
16	RAFFAELE SENESE
17	EZRA SERRUR
18	DON SMITH
19	PETER J. SPROFERA
20	CALIN THOMAS ST. HENRY
21	GERD STABBERT
22	PAUL STAPLETON
23	COURTNEY BURKS STEADMAN
24	BRIAN STOUT
25	VINCE SULLIVAN

	1 g 11 01 25	1
		Page 11
1	NIKHIL SURI	
2	CATHY TA	
3	LUCY L. THOMSON	
4	DAVID TURETSKY	
5	ELVIN TURNER	
6	CHRISTIAN TVERSTED	
7	VICTOR UBIERNA DE LAS HERAS	
8	OLGA ULANOVA	
9	TONY VEJSELI	
10	CAROLINE WARREN	
11	CARL N. WEDOFF	
12	MELANIE WESTOVER YANEZ	
13	ZACHARY A. WILDES	
14	KEITH WOFFORD	
15	LILY YARBOROUGH	
16	ANNE YEILDING	
17	TAK YEUNG	
18	ANDREW YOON	
19		
20		
21		
22		
23		
24		
25		

Page 12 1 PROCEEDINGS 2 CLERK: All right. Starting the recording for January 10th, 2023 at 11:00 a.m. Calling 22-1139, Celsius 3 Network Limited et al. versus Stone et al. All right. For 4 5 the parties that have joined -- one person dropped off --6 Kaila, if you could unmute and give your appearance, please. MS. ZAHARIS: Hi. 7 I'm actually not appearing 8 today. I'm just listening. I'm here for the Celsius 9 adversary proceeding. CLERK: Right. So we'll be starting at 11:00. Is 10 11 Michael Stanley going to be speaking? MS. ZAHARIS: I do not believe so. I actually 12 13 don't believe he'll be attending. 14 CLERK: Okay. Do you know if anyone from 15 Plaintiff's counsel is attending? 16 MS. ZAHARIS: Yes. They will be -- they will 17 likely be logging on closer to 11:00. I think they got the 18 memo that they don't need to join yet, but I do --19 CLERK: Got you. 20 MS. ZAHARIS: But it will Mitch Hurley, Dean 21 Chapman, and Lizzie Scott. 22 CLERK: Okay. Great. Thank you. 23 MS. ZAHARIS: Apologies for being quite early. CLERK: No problem. No problem. All right. You 24 25 can pause the recording.

	1 g 15 01 25
	Page 13
1	(Recording paused)
2	CLERK: All right. Mr. Hurley, if we could get
3	your appearance, please.
4	MR. HURLEY: Certainly. Mitch Hurley with Akin
5	Gump Strauss Hauer & Feld on behalf of the Plaintiffs,
6	Celsius Network and Celsius KeyFi.
7	CLERK: All right. Thank you. Mr. Chapman?
8	MR. CHAPMAN: Good morning. Dean Chapman of Akin
9	Gump Strauss Hauer & Feld for the Celsius Plaintiffs in the
10	Celsius versus Stone adversary proceeding.
11	CLERK: Okay. Thank you. Mr. Roche?
12	MR. ROCHE: Kyle Roche from Kyle Roche PA on
13	behalf of Jason Stone and KeyFi, Inc.
14	CLERK: Right. And Elizabeth Scott is going to
15	join in a moment, Judge.
16	THE COURT: Okay.
17	CLERK: Good morning, Elizabeth. If you could
18	unmute and give your appearance, -please.
19	MS. SCOTT: Good morning. Elizabeth Scott,
20	special litigation counsel on behalf of the Celsius
21	Plaintiffs.
22	CLERK: All right. Thank you. Judge, would you
23	like to start?
24	THE COURT: Yes, I would. Thank you very much and
25	good morning to everybody.

I wanted to update you all on a problem and see how we'll deal with it. Unfortunately, my wife has COVID-19 and under the protocol that our court has adopted which is essentially the district court protocol, I'm not permitted - - I've -- as of yesterday, I was negative -- but I'm not permitted to enter the courthouse, and so, you know, I wanted to get your input. We can proceed in one of two ways.

One is with me remote and that would still leave questions whether you all should be in the courtroom and I will have -- be able to observe and participate from home in everything that goes on in the courtroom. So you will each be able to cross-examine witnesses in front of you rather than on a Zoom screen.

And the other alternative which is a difficult one for me is moving the hearing dates. My calendar is extremely crowded over the next month or so. I've looked at it and I would have to move some matters around, but the alternative that I see as available with moving some things around would be for -- and we set aside two days for this. I don't know in light of your, you know, narrowing, you know, exhibits and -- whether you still need -- feel you need two days, but Wednesday, January 25th, Thursday, January 26th and Friday, January 27th are really the first dates that I -- with moving things around, I could make

myself available.

So those, unfortunately, are the alternatives that we face right now. Needless to say, it's not what I had hoped for but, you know, under the current protocol, I can't enter the courthouse. The earliest -- assuming that I continue to test negative, the earliest I could enter the courthouse is next week.

MR. ROCHE: Your Honor, this is Kyle Roche for Defendants. Our preference would be to go forward tomorrow and have Your Honor appear remote.

THE COURT: Mr. Hurley?

MR. HURLEY: Your Honor, first of all, I hope your wife feels better soon and I hope you don't come down with it. So, you know, I think we probably would be okay either way. I mean, we did talk about the -- kind of importance of assessing credibility in this case.

THE COURT: I agree with that.

MR. HURLEY: So that's the only thing that makes me hesitate at all. So -- but certainly, if the Court has a preference, we will be guided by that.

THE COURT: I don't have a preference other than that because, you know, in the preparation I've done to this point, credibility does seem to be quite important, and for that reason, if the trial goes forward over the next few days, it's my strong preference that you all be together so

that we have in effect live cross-examination.

The technology that we have in my courtroom will certainly allow me to have full screen of the witness. What I would do is -- I have all of your exhibits and I will use a second computer with the exhibits on it so that -- I don't want you sharing the screen. The problem with sharing the screen is I wind up with a very small image of the witness. I want to be able to view -- have a full view of whoever is testifying, and I am able to do that. It will be a little odd. You'll be looking at an empty judge's chair.

I would have my law clerks in the courtroom during the hearing, but because obviously credibility from both sides' standpoint is a key factor here, I do want you all in the same room. I don't know whether Akin Gump has a -- you know, the other alternative -- some firms have mute courtrooms in their offices. I don't know whether Akin does or not. One place or another, I want you all together.

MR. HURLEY: We don't have mute courtroom. We have conference space, certainly, that has some technology, but I know that my team has been down to court already and I think it's been pretty happy with the technology that's in the courtroom. So I'm not sure that we're going to be able to match that at Akin on short notice.

THE COURT: That would be then -- you'd all be in the courtroom and, you know, you will -- I think you should

Page 17 1 be able to see me on the screen -- on one of the screens. 2 There are large screens in the courtroom, and I will --3 assuming we go forward -- I mean, I had a conversation 4 yesterday with the clerk -- chief deputy clerk of the court. 5 Obviously, I've talking with my law clerks. This is all just really come up in the last few days, obviously, but --7 so I did have the discussion and it seemed to me -- again, I 8 had tried to see whether there were dates that I could cut 9 out for -- you know, carve out for next week and that just 10 wasn't feasible. There's some other Celsius hearings and 11 other things. 12 MR. HURLEY: I'm actually gone next week. I'm in another state. 13 14 THE COURT: Okay. 15 MR. HURLEY: To answer your questions, Your Honor, 16 my belief is that this is a one-day hearing. 17 THE COURT: Okay. 18 MR. HURLEY: If that is any help. I wonder if it 19 makes sense for me and Mr. Roche to confer briefly and come 20 back to you with a final conclusion on where we stand. 21 THE COURT: Sure. 22 MR. HURLEY: Would that work? THE COURT: Yeah. So let me ask this now and --23 24 what I've been trying to focus on is, what's the area of 25 continued disagreement between you as to what relief the

Debtor should be entitled to. Let me hear from you first,

Mr. Hurley.

MR. HURLEY: Yes. So the primary thrust -remaining thrust -- of our motion is that Celsius is seeking
an injunction -- a status quo injunction -- requiring that
the assets that we maintain were misappropriated from the
Celsius wallets and the proceeds of those assets will not be
further dissipated or transferred so that they'll still be
there as at the end of the case if Celsius prevails. And
that's the primary thing -- my understanding -- that the
Defendants disagree with. They don't -- they want to be
able to continue to use those assets.

We also have asked the Court to limit the

Defendants use of things like Tornado Cash. Right now, you

can't use Tornado Cash, obviously, because it's been banned.

But also any other kind of mixer that would allow the

Defendants to conceal the destination of transfers. That's

important to us, but it's sort of the secondary, I guess,

branch of relief that still remains. The main one is the

freezing of the assets during the course of the case.

THE COURT: All right. Mr. Roche.

MR. ROCHE: Yes. I think Mr. Hurley fairly accurately summarizes the remaining dispute. Essentially, the core contention is that the transfers at issue here were authorized. Celsius on one hand for -- an affidavit

submitted by Mr. Mashinsky claims that the transactions at issue were unauthorized. We claim the transactions were authorized as part of the compensation owed to KeyFi under the asset purchase agreement entered into on January 11th, 2021.

That's the core issue. We oppose the relief requested -- the status quo -- on a separate ground. That is, as part of the asset purchase agreement, the only assets left with KeyFi were the assets that are issue. If a status quo injunction were entered, that would leave KeyFi without the ability to defend itself and pay legal fees. We -- the assets that, you know, we worked as Your Honor is well aware -- we've worked over the past couple weeks to give as detailed of a mapping as we're capable of concerning the assets -- where the assets were two years ago and where the assets are now.

The parties -- Defendants -- don't plan on moving the assets except to pay for expenses as they arise and for -- KeyFi is continuing to use the assets to earn interest in the -- as one does in the decentralized finance space and so they do not believe it's appropriate given the standards for preliminary injunction for Celsius to be entitled to, one, those activities to stop, and two, for those assets to no longer be available to pay for costs and fees in this case.

MR. HURLEY: Your Honor, I didn't understand you

to be asking for argument. I obviously have some responses to what Mr. Roche just said. I'm happy to --

THE COURT: No. I understand. I'm not looking for the argument. It looked from what I reviewed, the -- what Mr. Roche just raised about using assets to fund the defense of the action -- I understood that as part of -- one of the things they wanted to continue to do. I don't know whether you've tried to reach -- and I certainly understand if you haven't done it, Mr. Hurley -- that is, whether you can reach an agreement on a permissible budget as to how much you would permit to be used and -- rather than proceed with the preliminary injunction, you could seek to agree to an expedited schedule to permit, you know, a final adjudication of the matter which would include a final injunction and whatever other relief you're seeking.

I'm not pushing it. I'm just inquiring.

MR. HURLEY: Let me respond in two ways. First, there is substantial case law that we'll citing to Your Honor that under circumstances like these where the amount in question seeking to enjoined is amount that the Plaintiff believes that he has an equitable interest in and is the amount that is the subject of the action that a defendants plea that the injunction be refused because they want to use those assets to pay their own legal fees should be rejected, but having said that, after the last call, we did as you

Pg 21 of 29 Page 21 asked and we had another discussion about potential settlement. Without getting into the details, you know, we discussed the possibility of various routes to avoiding the hearing and we were not in the same ballpark. THE COURT: Okay. That's fine. All right. All right. Let's plan on going forward tomorrow. I will work our tech people this afternoon to try and firm up how the technology will work. I mean, from your standpoint, other than looking at an empty chair in front of you, I think it will operate in the ordinary way. Let me ask, who are the live witnesses who I will hear from? First Mr. Hurley. MR. HURLEY: Alex Mashinsky and Patrick Holert. THE COURT: Okay. Mr. Roche? Jason Stone and Connor Nolan. MR. ROCHE: MR. HURLEY: And, Your Honor, we had discussed the possibility of me and Mr. Roche conferring once before finalizing whether we're going to proceed tomorrow. Is that still something that --THE COURT: Sure. Why don't you do that. I will -- I'll be touch. You know, I'm going to speak with the clerk and the chief deputy clerk and some of the tech people to make sure -- and as I say, I did talk yesterday about it

we went through a scenario that this would go forward with

me not in the judge's chair. But as I said, I will have the

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

exhibits on a separate computer, and so what you'll need to do is -- and I think I have them organized in separate directories -- Plaintiff -- and then directories so you'll just have to be sure to call out which exhibit and give me just a chance to find it on the computer.

It shouldn't be -- I've done the -- I mean, I've had several trials during the pandemic and they actually worked reasonably well and what I did in those was I used multiple computers again, and they were completely remote -- people weren't in the courtroom -- but they were completely remote, but I used to avoid the sharing of the screen, because I want to see the witness, using multiple -- I had multiple computers. I had the exhibits. It worked pretty well so I've done this before and (indiscernible) you'll all be in the courtroom.

MR. HURLEY: And we'll speak hopefully immediately after this and we'll get back to you within (indiscernible) an hour.

THE COURT: Why don't you -- you can call my law clerk Daniel Slemmer. You can email him and then he'll be in touch with me and let me know. As I say, when I looked at the calendar, realistically, the first dates -- and it would require some juggling of other things on the calendar but I concluded I could do that -- would be Wednesday, Thursday, Friday, January 25 through the 27th and I'm not

Pg 23 of 29 Page 23 expecting it's going to take three days. But those were the days that I could -- because I like to do things consecutive days. I don't like two hours here or an hour there, you I like to hear things from start to finish. know. So why don't you -- why don't the two of you confer and let Mr. Slemmer know and he'll promptly let me know. Okay? MR. ROCHE: Okay. Can I raise one thing while we have you here, Your Honor? THE COURT: Absolutely. MR. HURLEY: Okay. So in the event that the trial does go forward tomorrow, it relates to the exhibits. On January 4th, the parties exchanged exhibit lists (indiscernible) the Court's instruction and last night, quite late, around 11:00, the Defendants asked to add I think 12 new exhibits to the list. Some of the exhibits are exhibits that we did not produce until -- we being Celsius -- didn't produce until December 29th. But that's -- but they were not a part of the expedited discovery that Your Honor allowed and that the parties agree to. We produced everything in that expedited round, you know, on time. Then we continued with plenary discovery and made a production on December 19th. So of the materials

that they've asked to add to the exhibit list last night --

www.veritext.com

first of all, one of the documents we produced with the

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

expedited stuff back on December 16th I think and it's a spreadsheet with 9,000 lines in it.

And then are some materials that they've -- that are public. There's some tweets and some Etherscan printouts and all of those things we I guess would submit -- it's too late to add them to the exhibit list. I mean, I don't know about substantively but we've done a lot of prep already and to have a whole bunch of new exhibits put on us, you know, 24 hours before the hearing is problematic.

And then remainder are from the December 29th production and I guess with respect to those, again, we'd just submit that, you know, there was some time to identify them and put them on the list and we haven't seen them and it's just too late. My understanding, Your Honor, was that when you instructed us to engage in expedited discovery, the instruction to both sides was, figure out what you think you need, ask for it on a expedited basis, and that's what you're going to rely on at the hearing. And Mr. Roche did that. Celsius did that.

We exchanged expedited discovery and those materials were available in plenty of time to put on exhibit lists and to supplement it now, we submit, it would be inconsistent at least with our understanding of the exercise back on November 23rd and gives us very little time to review the new exhibits and prepare.

THE COURT: Mr. Roche, let me give you a chance to respond.

MR. ROCHE: Yes, Your Honor. The number of exhibits we're talking about is 12 exhibits. Your Honor did say that we did not need to put impeachment exhibits on the exhibit list and while there are a few that we did add that were produced as part of the initial document exchange as we've been preparing over the past week and given the holiday crunch, we would respectfully submit that, given the limited number, we should have those on the list and especially because at least a few of the exhibits were not produced until after the parties exchanged and we do believe are highly relevant to both, you know, the credibility determinations that Your Honor has to make and are relevant for the underlying issues at the heart of this hearing.

THE COURT: All right. How many of the documents were produced after December 29th of the ones that --

MR. HURLEY: None were after December 29th, Your Honor. The later produced documents were produced on December 29th and they were not a part of the expedited discovery process. They were just part of our regular rolling production.

THE COURT: Well, look, here -- I'm going to permit Mr. Roche to add them to his list. They need to be marked. I need to get them. I'm going to reserve any

decision whether I'm going to permit them to be used. In part, it's going to depend on for purpose they're being used. Are they being used for impeachment which didn't have to be included, and I'll just reserve decision.

You know, for present purposes and preparing, Mr. Hurley, you ought to assume they'll come in. I don't know if they will or they won't, but I'm going to permit them to be added to the list. Just make sure, Mr. Roche, that we get them because I won't be in the courtroom and so I need to get them today.

MR. ROCHE: Understood, Your Honor. We will send those over as soon as possible. I guess to the -- I believe these are all the impeachment exhibits we planned to use. To the extent we have any other impeachment exhibits, given that Your Honor won't be in the court, how would you like us to handle that in the hearing?

THE COURT: You ought to email copies of the impeachment exhibits to my law clerk Mr. Slemmer who can send them to me.

MR. ROCHE: Understood.

THE COURT: And you should have copies, obviously, in the courtroom available for Mr. Hurley and his colleagues as well. But I -- you know, I need -- so I need electronic copies of them, in other words, so you need to -- if they're pdfs or -- get them to Mr. Slemmer. He'll get them to me.

MR. ROCHE: Understood. So we would submit those to Your Honor ex parte?

THE COURT: Yes, you will. Yes.

MR. ROCHE: Understood.

whether they come in and if they do, they do. So they ought to be pre-marked and you'll provide them to Mr. Slemmer who can provide them to me. And it's ex parte because they're, you know -- we'll see whether they -- for what purpose they come in. Not all impeachment exhibits come in where the truth of the matter's asserted, but we'll have to deal with that tomorrow during the hearing.

MR. ROCHE: Understood. One final point, Your Honor, that's I guess related to the reasons Your Honor called this hearing. One of our team members was in close proximity to somebody who has been diagnosed with COVID.

We're following the procedures and the guidelines that the court has set. That member will be wearing an N95 mask tomorrow, will take a test today to ensure that they're negative ahead of tomorrow's hearing and -- I wanted to -- while we're discussing it, if Your Honor has any other guidelines given the situation, we're happy to follow them.

THE COURT: So having looked at the protocol again yesterday, you know, it draws a distinction between someone who's been in close contact but doesn't reside with the

Page 28 1 person who is -- I have the situation. I obviously reside 2 with my wife and the protocol in that instance says, don't 3 enter the courthouse. Mr. Hurley, I don't know whether you want to respond to this. I mean, I -- consistent with the 4 5 protocol, if someone has had limited contact with someone 6 but is still testing negative, I think they're permitted in 7 the courthouse -- in the courtroom. 8 MR. HURLEY: Perhaps Kyle and I can discuss it 9 when we talk after this and I'll get some more details, but 10 I'm sure we can work something out. 11 THE COURT: That's fine. Okay. All right. Sorry for this snafu but we will go forward. Okay? 12 13 MR. HURLEY: Thank you, Your Honor. 14 THE COURT: Thanks very much. 15 MR. ROCHE: Thank you, Your Honor. 16 THE COURT: All right. We're adjourned. 17 CLERK: All right. Please stop --18 (Whereupon these proceedings were concluded.) 19 20 21 22 23 24 25

Page 29 1 CERTIFICATION 2 3 I, Sonya Ledanski Hyde, certified that the foregoing 4 transcript is a true and accurate record of the proceedings. 5 Songa M. deslarshi Hydl 6 7 8 Sonya Ledanski Hyde 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 Veritext Legal Solutions 21 330 Old Country Road 22 Suite 300 23 Mineola, NY 11501 24 25 Date: January 12, 2023